



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,564	10/11/2001	Paul G. Allen	10003.001100 (digeo 129)	7500

32641 7590 07/02/2003

DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
ONE UTAH CENTER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

WILSON, JACQUELINE B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2612

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/975,564

Applicant(s)
Allen

Examiner
Jacqueline Wilson

Art Unit
2612



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 11, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show elements 155A and 15 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 21-25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 21-25 should be numbered 21-26. There are two claims numbered 21;

Claims 22 and 23 depend on Claim 21. It is unclear as to which claim 21 these claims depend on.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2612

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (US 5,606,364).

Regarding Claim 1, Kim'364 teaches a system for controlling a plurality of cameras (referred to as image signal input block 10 [11-1n]) comprising a camera controller (40), a plurality of addressable power switches (col. 3, lines 58-60; 20), an output device (60), and a switch controller controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable power switches (also 40).

Regarding Claim 2, Kim'264 teaches the switch controller controls application of power to the plurality of cameras (col. 3, lines 54-61). Kim further teaches that each image is sequentially input according to the connection of the switches for monitoring (col. 3, lines 61-64 and lines 47+). This inherently explains that when power is transmitted through the power switch for activating a particular camera, the signal is sent to the monitor for viewing. The automatic mode displays the images in a preset order one image at a time and the manual mode enables the user to select which camera to provide power from to view on the monitor. This reads on the limitation of the switch controller controls application of power to the plurality of video cameras such that power is applied to a single video camera at a time.

Regarding Claim 5, Kim'264 teaches the switch controller is integrated into the camera controller (40).

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding Claim 11, Kim'364 teaches a camera controller (40), a switch controller (also 40), a plurality of addressable power switches (col. 3, lines 58-60; 20) that control application of power to the plurality of cameras. Kim fails to specifically disclose a memory configured with a camera control process. However, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the controller inherently has a memory for maintaining control programs for manipulating the camera. For example, Kim teaches in the surveillance system, the user may select which mode, using the mode selection block (50), to use for viewing output signals from the cameras (col. 3, lines 47+). Once the appropriate selection is made, the controller is responsible for utilizing a camera control process for transmitting codes to the switch controller (using a form of communication bus) for manipulating the addressable power switches. Therefore, a memory means is deemed inherent by the examiner for the purpose of maintaining these codes for proper operation of the power switches.

Claim 14 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 3. (See rejection of Claim 3 above.)

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2612

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3-4, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,606,364).

Regarding Claims 3 and 4, Kim'364 fails to teach the switch controller (40) includes a wireless transmitter, wherein the addressable power switches includes wireless receivers, and wherein the transmitter transmits radio frequency signals to the wireless receivers and the wireless receivers receive radio frequency signals from the wireless transmitter. However, Official Notice is taken for the fact that wireless controllers are notoriously well known in the art. The advantages of using wireless transmission using wireless receivers and transmitters over wired communication is less restriction of using the controller by providing greater mobility of the user, and also eliminating the inconvenience of using a wire for communication purposes.

Regarding Claim 7, Kim'364 teaches a surveillance system in which a plurality of camera devices are switched for viewing. Although Kim'364 fails to specifically disclose a camera control process that provides commands from remote access controllers to the camera controller, one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that surveillance rooms for observing different camera locations obviously includes remote access controllers such that the user may manipulate the camera; in this case, select which mode using the mode selection block (50) by the user. This allows the user to view selected areas remotely from the camera. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art for a camera control process to

Art Unit: 2612

provide commands from remote access controllers to the camera controller, especially for surveillance purposes.

7. Claims 6, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,606,364) in view of Ogasawara (US 6,543,052).

Regarding Claim 6, Kim'364 fails to teach the camera controller is integrated into customer premises equipment that is communicatively coupled to a cable network. However, Ogasawara'052 teaches a set-top box (STB) which is coupled to cable providers, Internet Service Provider (ISP), to name a few (col. 3, lines 52+), and is also capable of controlling various peripheral devices such as a camera printer, etc. (see fig. 1). Ogasawara'052 teaches that by controlling the peripheral devices using a centralized control through the STB helps facilitate their access and management (col. 4, lines 1-3). This would be advantageous in Kim'364 for controlling the plurality cameras by using an STB such that all devices may be controlled along with a variety of other devices and providers. The STB also gives the system versatility by including cable connections as well as Internet service for transmitting and receiving video images from remote locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to integrate the controller of Kim'364 into a customer premises equipment (such as a STB) that is communicatively coupled to a cable network for producing a multifaceted device capable of transmitting and receiving information.

Art Unit: 2612

Claims 16 and 17 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claim 18 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

8. **Claims 8, 9, 12-13, 15, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,606,364) in view of Bellman, Jr. et al. (4,831,438).**

Regarding Claims 8 and 9, Kim'364 fails to teach an authentication process limits commands accepted to only authorized commands or an encryption process provides security to video signals transmitted from the camera controller to a remote access controller. However, Bellman, Jr teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (col. 4, lines 39+) and an encryption process (fig. 1, 470). This prevents unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kim'364 with Bellman, Jr for providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes.

Claims 12 and 13 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 8 and 9. Although, Bellman, Jr fails to specifically teach a memory is configured with the authentication process and encryption process, one having ordinary skill would recognize that it would be essential to store these processes in a storage area for storing program codes needed to activate each process for

Art Unit: 2612

securing access in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the memory for storing an authentication and encryption processes.

Regarding Claim 15, Kim'364 fails to specifically teach the switch controller comprises a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals. However, Bellman, Jr teaches a switch controller (referred to as an integral module 100) which includes a decoder (170) for decoding command codes. Bellman, Jr specifically discloses that commands are encrypted to prevent unauthorized operation of the surveillance system and decrypted by the decoder (170) for generating control signals for the switch means (col. 3, lines 21+). It would have been obvious to include this process in Kim'364 for the purpose creating a secure environment for transmitting and receiving data in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kim'364 with Bellman, Jr by including the switch controller comprising a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals.

Claim 19 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 11-13. (Claim 19 is a method of Claims 11-13. See rejection of Claims 11-13 above.)

Regarding Claim 20, Kim'364 fails to specifically teach transmitting occurs by sending signals over AC power lines that provides the power to video cameras and the power switch controller. However, Official Notice is taken that AC power lines are notoriously well known in the art for supplying power to a variety of devices, such as cameras, through wired connections for operation purposes.

Art Unit: 2612

Claim 21 (1) is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 3 and 4. (See rejection of Claims 3 and 4 above.)

Regarding Claim 21 (2), Kim'364 teaches that in the surveillance system, the plurality of camera are placed either in a bank, a large department store, or even in the home as a method of peace preservation and security purposes (col. 1, lines 29+). This teaches that the plurality of cameras are placed about a premises of a customer. This allows the customer to supervise the immediate area locally.

Regarding Claim 22, Kim teaches that the surveillance system includes a plurality of cameras which may be placed in a bank, department store, or in the home, as discussed in Claim 21 (2). This inherently indicates that the command is received from a local system within the premises of the customer such that operation and supervision are performed within the area of the surveillance system.

Regarding Claim 23, Kim fails to specifically disclose the command is received from a remote system outside the premises of the customer. However, Bellman, Jr.'438 teaches a "tethered remote" surveillance system that uses commands from a remote system (see abstract and also fig. 1). Bellman, Jr.'438 discloses that it is important to use a remote system while using the surveillance system such that the system is not visible to personnel in or around the area being monitored (col. 1, lines 62+). This prevents unauthorized people from knowing the system exists and enable anonymous operation of the surveillance system. Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2612

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to receive the command from a remote system outside the premises of the customer.

Claim 24 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

9. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 5,606,364) in view of Monroe (US 6,366,311).**

Regarding Claim 10, Kim'364 fails to specifically teach the plurality of video cameras comprise wireless transmitters for sending video signals to the output device and wherein the output device comprises a wireless receiver for receiving video signals from the plurality of video cameras. However, Monroe teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to have a plurality of cameras transmitting wireless signals to an output device (see fig. 6). This provides transmission of video signals without the use of wire and enables easier installation of the video cameras and the output device. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Kim'364 by allowing the cameras to transmit signals over a wireless communication.

10. **Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bellman, Jr. et al'438.**

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding Claim 25, Bellman, Jr teaches a method for providing access to a plurality of cameras (fig. 1, 200), the method comprising receiving a command from a requestor to view images from a particular camera of the plurality of video cameras wherein the command as received is encrypted using a "private Key" of the requestor (col. 4, lines 50+), decrypting the command if the command is authentic (col. 4, lines 50-56), processing the command to determine if the command is authorized and if it is authentic and authorized, then encrypting a video signal from the camera by using the public key such that the requestor may decrypt the signal using the private key and transmitting the encrypted signal to the requestor (col. 5, lines 17+).

Conclusion

11. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (alternate Fridays off) from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9314.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2612

or Faxed to:


(703) 872-9314, (for informal or draft communications, please label

“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

June 25, 2003


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600